MEDICAL BOARD OF CALIFORNIA

INITIAL STATEMENT OF REASONS

Hearing Date: January 30, 2004

Subject Matter of Proposed Regulations: Public disclosure of information about physicians on the Medical Board of California's Web site.

(1) Section(s) Affected: Title 16, California Code of Regulations section 1355.35

Specific Purpose of each adoption, amendment, or repeal:

The proposed regulation will standardize and formalize the language used by the Medical Board to assist the public to better understand now to use the information about physicians presented on the Board's Web site.

Factual Basis/Rationale

Factual basis for determination that each proposed change is necessary:

SB 1950 (Figueroa, Statutes of 2002, Chapter 1085) requires the Medical Board of California to adopt by regulation the language it uses on its Web Site's physician profiles (Business and Professions Code sections 803.1(b)(5) and 2027(a)(7)).

Medical Board staff developed the terminology used by working with managers from the Medical Board, Medical Board members, representatives from the Center for Law in the Public Interest, the Health Quality Enforcement Section of the Attorney General's Office, the California Medical Association, and other public representatives.

Underlying Data

Technical, theoretical or empirical studies or reports relied upon (if any):

n/a

Business Impact

This regulation will not have a significant adverse economic impact on businesses. This initial determination is based on the following facts or evidence/documents/testimony:

The regulation merely standardizes the language that the Medical Board uses on its Web site to present information as directed in statute. This language does not establish any independent reporting scheme.

Specific Technologies or Equipment

This regulation does not mandate the use of specific technologies or equipment.

Consideration of Alternatives

No reasonable alternative to the regulation would be either more effective in carrying out the purpose for which the action is proposed or would be as effective and less burdensome to affected private persons than the proposed regulation.

Set forth below are the alternatives which were considered and the reasons each alternative was rejected:

Do nothing and be in violation of the statutes.